THE

CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF GENTLEMEN.

FOR THE YEAR

1827.

NEW SERIES.—VOLUME I.

PUBLISHED FOR THE EDITOR,

BY HEZEKIAH HOWE, NEW-HAVEN; AND J. P. HAVEN, NEW-YORK.

NEW-HAVEN:

PRINTED BY TREADWAY AND ADAMS.

THE

CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

New Series.

Vol. I.] MAY, 1827. [No. V.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

WHEN DOES THE SABBATH BEGIN?

The question when the Sabbath begins, or whether Saturday or Sabbath evening belongs to the Sabbath, is a question of no little importance. The difference of opinion and practice among professing Christians as to the time when the Sabbath begins, doubtless has influence in weakening in the minds of people, a reverence for that sacred day. They observe professors conversing about the world, and attending to their secular concerns on both Saturday and Sabbath evenings. And those who observe different evenings will interrupt each other in their devotions and lead one another into worldly conversation, and insensibly lessen their respect for the holy Sabbath. —How desirable then that there should be, in this respect, an agreement. And is there not sufficient light on the subject in the scriptures to settle the question, if examined carefully and impartially? There are three passages in the Bible which are generally adduced to prove that Saturday evening belongs to the Sabbath. And though doctrines and duties are usually taught in more numerous places; yet, if these three are explicit and unequivocal, they ought to decide the point. But, if it is doubtful whether they do afford the supposed proof, and there are many more passages, which seem to teach that the evening following the day belongs to the Sabbath, then every one, who wishes to take the Bible as the standard of his faith and practice, will carefully compare these passages together, and candidly enquire which afford the greater weight of evidence?

The first argument in favor of observing Saturday evening as holy time is drawn from Gen. i. 5, &c. "The evening and the morning were the first day." As the evening is mentioned first, it is inferred that the day began with the evening preceding, and included the night and the following day; though in this same verse the day is mentioned before the night. "God called the light day, and the darkness he called night." And therefore according to this mode of reasoning, we might infer that the day preceded the night. The evening and morning include twenty-four hours.—Consequently, if the evening began at sunset, it must have extended to sunrise, and the morning from sunrise to sunset. But it is contrary to scripture and universal practice to call the time from midnight to sunrise *evening*, and from noon to sunset *morning*. The time before sunrise is often called morning. See Gen. xix. 15, 23, 27. Ex. xii. 29—33, 42, compared with verse 22. Ex. xiv. 24. Ruth iii. 14. 1 Sam. xxv. 22, 34. Ps. cxix. 147. Dan. vi. 19. Mark i. 35. But if the evening begins the day and extends to sunrise, then the time before sunrise is not morning, but

Digitized by Google

evening. As the evening is the close of the day, there could be no evening before there was a day. And the evening succeeding the day, properly belongs to the day; and is so reckoned in the scriptures, as I shall presently show.

If in Gen. i. 5, it had been said the morning and the evening were the first day, I presume no one would have thought of beginning the day at sunrise, and extending the morning to sunset, and then extending the evening from sunset to sunrise. But they would have considered the day as beginning at midnight, and the morning as extending from midnight to noon; and the evening as extending from noon to midnight, as we all reckon. All call the time from midnight to noon *morning*, and from noon to midnight *evening*.—And how much stress ought to be laid on the mentioning of the evening first, when the order of time is often inverted in the scriptures? It is said that Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth. And Japheth was the elder; and Ham the younger; Gen. v. 32, and ix. 24, and x. 31. In Acts v. 30, and x. 39 it is said, the Jews slew Christ, and hanged him on a tree, which according to this argument would prove that they slew him before they hung him on the cross. 2 Tim. i. 9, "Who hath saved us and called us." Here salvation is put before effectual calling or regeneration. Jude verse 1—sanctified—preserved in Jesus Christ, and called. Here sanctification is put before regeneration. In 1 Cor. vi. 11, sanctification is mentioned before justification. Upon which Dr. Scott remarks, "the arrangement of the expression in the 11th verse shows that no argument can be drawn *merely* from that circumstance in respect to controverted points of doctrine." If this remark be correct, then no argument in favour of keeping Saturday evening can be drawn from the circumstance that in Gen. i. 5, the evening is mentioned first.

2. Lev. xxiii. 32, "From even to even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath," is adduced to prove that the weekly Sabbath begins at sunset, though it has no reference to the weekly Sabbath, which is enjoined verse 3d, but to the great day of atonement. But if one evening only is here included, which is it? Does *from* one include that, any more than *to* the other includes that? In this chapter several solemn feasts are enjoined, which are called Sabbaths. And as the time for celebrating none except this is thus mentioned, does it not seem to imply that the appointed time was peculiar to this? As if it had been said, "from even to even shall ye celebrate this Sabbath." As the day of atonement was a peculiarly solemn day, in which the people were to "afflict their souls," it is probable that both evenings were observed, which is the opinion of some commentators, who say that it was kept from sunset to midnight of the next day. That both evenings were included appears from similar expressions in this chapter and other places. In verses 15 and 16, the children of Israel were directed to count *from* the morrow after the Sabbath seven Sabbaths complete, even *into* the morrow after the seventh Sabbath—fifty days. Now unless both of these morrows be included it will not make fifty days. Ex. xii. 15, "Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread;—from the first day *until* the seventh day. Here both days are included to make the seven days. In verse 11th, *until* the fourteenth day included that day; because the paschal lamb was killed and eaten on the evening following the fourteenth day, as I shall show beyond all doubt. In verse 18th *until* the one and twentieth day includes that day. And in Lev. xxiii. 32, the very verse

Digitized by Google

containing the supposed argument which we are examining, the evening *preceding* the tenth day is called the evening of the *ninth* day. The Israelites were to celebrate the tenth day as the day of atonement; but were to begin on the evening of the *ninth* day and keep the evening of the ninth day, and the following day. So that this affords no evidence that the weekly Sabbath begins Saturday evening.

3. It is urged that the Jews brought their sick to Christ to be healed when the sun was set Sabbath evening, because they considered it unlawful to heal on the Sabbath, and because the Sabbath ended at sunset. See Matt. viii. 5—18. Mark i. 21—34. There is however no intimation that they viewed it unlawful to heal on the Sabbath, but the contrary, and no intimation that they brought their sick when the sun was set, because the Sabbath was ended; but it is a mere assumption. He had cast out an unclean spirit, and healed two that day, viz. the centurion's servant and Peter's wife's mother, both by request, and the servant, by the urgent entreaties of the elders of the Jews, (Luke vii. 3, 4,) and without any complaint from any one. On the contrary they spread abroad his fame. But did they spread abroad his fame for breaking the Sabbath? That the Scribes and Pharisees and chief priests did not view his healing on the Sabbath a breach of the Sabbath, is manifest, notwithstanding their malignant cavils. For by his reply he put them to shame, Luke xiii. 10—17. The breach of the Sabbath was death. Ex. xxxi. 15. And if they had believed that Christ broke the Sabbath by healing on it, they need not have sought *false* witnesses to put him to death. For they could easily have proved that he healed on the Sabbath. Why then did they wait till the sun was set before they brought their sick at Capernaum? I answer, to avoid the intense heat of the sun, which Jahn in his Archaeology says is often very oppressive. Mr. Goodell, one of our missionaries in Palestine, to avoid suffering from the heat, "took care to keep himself quiet and within doors from sunrise to sunset." And they left their lodgings "in the evening, travelling all night to avoid the heat of the sun." Now, if the last clause containing the reason of their travelling in the evening and night, had been omitted and only the fact had been stated, as it is respecting the Jews' bringing their sick to Christ when the sun was set, might it not be urged that it was the Sabbath and they kept Saturday evening and would not travel till the evening was come, and the Sabbath ended? But if our missionaries in the same country travelled in the evening out of regard to their comfort, is it not reasonable to suppose the Jews brought their sick to Christ out of regard to their comfort?

4. It is urged that the Jews observed the evening preceding the Sabbath as belonging to the Sabbath. What was their practice while they were God's professing people, we must learn from the scriptures. And since their rejection, awful blindness and wickedness and disbelief of the New Testament, it little concerns us, in deciding upon the institutions of our holy religion, to know what their opinion and practice have been in their dispersed and unbelieving state. But

5. It is said that most commentators admit that the Jews kept the evening preceding the Sabbath as holy time.

I was once of the same opinion. And I founded it upon the passages, which I have been examining. And others have done the same. But I am now willing to submit it to the candid and judicious, to decide whether these passages do afford evidence that the Jews obser-

Digitized by Google

ved the evening preceding as belonging to the Sabbath. The learned Pool in his Synopsis, says, "As the Jews extended the preceding day to *midnight*, so they began the morning of the following day *at midnight*.

I will now adduce direct proof that the evening *succeeding*, and not the *preceding*, belonged to the Sabbath.

1. God expressly teaches that the evening *succeeding* the day belongs to the day. If the Sabbath began at sunset, then every other day began at the same hour, and the evening preceding always belonged to the day. But we shall find that God reckoned the evening following the day as belonging to the day. The day of atonement was to be observed on the tenth day of the month, Lev. xxiii. 27. But the evening preceding is called the evening of the *ninth* day, verse 32. But if the day had begun at sunset, the evening would have belonged to the *tenth* day. The children of Israel were commanded to kill the paschal lamb "at the going down of the sun," and to "eat it on the fourteenth day of the same month" at even, and to eat unleavened bread seven days unto the one and twentieth day at even—Deut. xvi. 6. Ex. xii. 6, viii. 18. Lev. xxiii. 5, 6. But if the fourteenth day began at sunset, then the evening would be the evening following the thirteenth day, and the first day of unleavened bread would be the fourteenth day. But it was the fifteenth day—Lev. xxiii. 6. Num. xxviii. 17. Hence the evening following the fourteenth and twenty-first day is called the evening of the fourteenth and twenty-first day.

The children of Israel went out of Egypt on the morrow after the passover, which would have been on the fourteenth day, if the fourteenth day had began at sunset, and they had eaten the passover on the evening following the thirteenth day. But in Num. xxxiii. 3, it is said they left Egypt "on the *fifteenth* day of the first month: on the morrow after the passover." Thus manifest is it that God even when speaking of solemn feasts, reckoned the evening *following* the day as belonging to the day. And in 1 Sam. xxx. 17, the Holy Spirit calls the evening *following* the day the evening of the day. "And David smote them from the twilight even unto the evening of the next day." Hence as God reckons the evening *following* the day as belonging to the day, and as I can no where find a different reckoning, I feel safe in inferring that the evening following the day belongs to the Sabbath. It would be truly unaccountable, if the evening *preceding* the day belonged to the day, that God himself should not reckon so, but should call the evening *following* the day the evening of the day.

2. In Nehem. xiii. 16—19, we find that to prevent the profanation of the Sabbath by the sale of fish, &c. by the men of Tyre, "when the gates began to be dark before the Sabbath, Nehemiah commanded that the gates should be shut." As they were not shut till it began to be *dark* they were not shut *before* the Sabbath, if the Sabbath began at sunset. And yet it is said they were shut before the Sabbath. And undoubtedly such a zealous reformer as Nehemiah would command the work of shutting the gates to be done *before* and not *after* the Sabbath began. If it be inquired why the gates were shut at dark if the Sabbath did not begin till midnight, I answer, had the Syrians been permitted to enter after dark, they could not have sold their wares that night, and would have lodged in the city, and sold them on the Sabbath, and the evil, which Nehemiah designed to remedy, would still exist.

3. In Matt. xxvi. 17, and Mark

Digitized by Google

xiv. 12, the fourteenth day of the month is called the *first* day of unleavened bread, which it could not be if it ended at sunset. The passover was to be eaten in the evening of the fourteenth day of the month. And no leavened bread was to be eaten afterwards for seven days—Ex. xii. 15, 18 The fifteenth day was therefore properly the *first* day of unleavened bread, Lev. xxiii. 6. Numb. xxviii. 17. But as they began to eat unleavened bread after, or with the passover, Ex. xii. 8, that evening, if the fifteenth day did not begin till midnight, was a part of the fourteenth day. Hence the fourteenth day might be called the *first* day of unleavened bread. But if the fourteenth day, on the evening of which the passover was eaten, ended at sunset, it could not with any propriety be called the *first* day of unleavened bread, because unleavened bread was not eaten until the beginning of the fifteenth day. And yet Matthew and Mark both call the fourteenth day, the *first* day of unleavened bread. As therefore unleavened bread was first eaten in the evening *following* the fourteenth day, they manifestly reckoned that evening as belonging to the fourteenth day. Luke says it was the day "in which the passover must be killed." But as it was killed in the evening, it was not in that day if it ended at sunset.

4. The account of the burial of Christ furnishes evidence that the Sabbath did not begin at sunset. It was in the evening when his body was put in the tomb. For "the evening was come when Joseph went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus." The evening here could not mean the first evening which began at noon, but the second, which began at sunset. For 1. Jesus had been παλαι, *a long time* dead, though he did not expire till after three o'clock, Mark xv. 44. That this is the meaning of παλαι, see Matt. xi. 21, Luke x. 13, 2 Pet. ii. 3. 2. The expression, "when the even was come," Matt. xxvii. 57, and Mark xv. 42, in other places means at or after sunset, Matt. vii, 15, compared with Mark i. 32. Matt. xx. 8, ix. 12. Matt. xxvi. 20, compared with Deut. xvi. 6, and John vi. 16, 17. 3. The evening generally means at or after sunset. Josh. x. 26, 27. 2 Chron. xviii. 34. Ezek. xii. 7. Ps. civ. 23. 4. Those who hold that the Sabbath begins at sunset, say that in Gen. i. 5, Lev. xxiii. 32, Matt. viii. 19, and Mark i. 32, the evening means sunset. 5. If the expression, "when the even was come," does not mean the second evening or sunset, no one can tell what it does mean, or what time had come.

It is therefore manifest, that it was sunset when Joseph "took the body of Jesus." And then he and Nicodemus, having "a mixture of myrrh and aloes about an hundred pounds weight," embalmed the body "as the manner of the Jews was to bury," John xix. 39, 40; which must have taken a considerable time. And as it was full moon, it was sufficiently light to do all they did, without inconvenience. And after the body was put in the tomb "the women which came with him from Galilee and beheld how the body was laid, returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Can any believe that it was not after sunset when they had prepared their spices and ointments? And yet, after they had done this, they "rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment," which required that no work should be done on the Sabbath. And therefore the Sabbath did not begin at sunset. And if it had begun at sunset, Christ's prediction must have failed that he should be three days and three nights or a part of three days (according to the Jews' man-

Digitized by Google

ner of reckoning,) in the heart of the earth or in the tomb. For being buried after the Jewish Sabbath began, and rising the next day, he was in the tomb only a part of *two* days. But if the day began at midnight, then he was in the earth according to the prediction, three days and three nights, or a part of three days. For he was buried on Friday evening before the Jewish Sabbath, and was all the next day or Saturday and a part of the first day of the week in the earth, or tomb. And this, I conceive, is absolutely conclusive. And the only way any evade the force of this argument is by denying contrary to all evidence, that Christ was buried before sunset.

5. The Apostles and primitive Christians met for religious worship on the evening succeeding, and not preceding, the first day of the week, and that evening was called the first day of the week. "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst." John xx. 19. This was the evening *succeeding* the first day of the week or Christian Sabbath. And yet it belonged to the first day of the week, or the Sabbath. For the *same day* at evening, being the first day of the week, means the same as the evening of the first day of the week. Consequently, the day had not then ended. At evening οψης οωσιας, it being evening implies that it was in the evening. It was "toward evening, and the day was far spent," when the two disciples, going to Emmaus, arrived there. And they stopped and took supper, and then walked back seven miles to Jerusalem, which probably took as much as two hours. And Christ did not appear to the disciples till after they had returned and "told what things were done in the way, and how he was known to them in the breaking of bread," when the evening must have been considerably advanced. And yet the first day of the week, or Christian Sabbath, had not then ended, but it was the first day of the week, Luke xxiv. 13, xxix. 36. The primitive Christians used to partake of the Lord's Supper every Sabbath. And when Paul came to Troas, he tarried there seven days, till the first day of the week. And when the disciples came together on the first day of the week to break bread, or celebrate the Lord's Supper, Paul preached to them in the evening of that day, and administered the holy supper. Scott supposes that to accommodate Christian servants, who had heathen masters, they met in the evening. But as it was their custom to celebrate the Lord's Supper on the *Sabbath*, if they considered the evening preceding, as belonging to the Sabbath, why did they not meet on that evening? Why did Paul wait till after the Sabbath was ended, before he began the solemn services? That it was really evening when he began, appears from the fact, that "there were many lights in the chamber, where they were gathered together." Hence as they used to celebrate the Lord's Supper on the Sabbath, and as they met the evening succeeding, and not preceding, the Sabbath, to celebrate it, we infer that they considered the evening succeeding as belonging to the Sabbath.

6. It is more convenient, and better calculated to promote the spiritual good of men, to observe as holy time, the evening succeeding the day. It is often impossible for those who keep Saturday evening, to know when their Sabbath begins. When it is cloudy, and they have not time-pieces (and these vary) they may not know within an hour, when the sun sets. How then will they know when to leave their work, and begin their Sabbath.

Digitized by Google

Often they cannot get their work out of the way by sunset. When on a journey, they may not be able to get home by that time. When getting in their hay and grain, they may be hindered by showers and otherwise so as to be detained at work till after sunset, and thus obliged to encroach upon the Sabbath if it begin at sunset. And there is so much to be done in families to prepare for the Sabbath, that when they profess to keep Saturday evening, they are apt to tresspass upon what they consider as holy time. And after they have been hurrying to get their work done, and their bodies are fatigued, and their minds filled with worldly cares, from which it is difficult immediately to disengage their attention, they will be poorly prepared to enter upon the sacred duties of the Sabbath. But if the Sabbath does not begin till midnight, people will have time to get their business out of the way, to banish worldly cares, to compose their minds, and prepare for "the solemn day." And their bodies and spirits, being refreshed by the repose of the night, they will be better fitted to enter upon the holy duties of the Sabbath. And in the evening of the Sabbath they will be more likely to reflect upon what they have heard and read, and to derive benefit from it, than if they felt that the Sabbath was ended, and they were at liberty to think and talk about, and attend to the world. Such a persuasion has a tendency to divert the attention from serious things, and to permit "the cares of the world to choke the word," and make it "unfruitful." And where Sabbath evening is not considered as holy time, young people and others, being already dressed in their best, will find it a very convenient time for visiting and amusement, where the conversation and employment will be such as will be directly calculated to divert the attention from the solemn truths, which they have heard during the day, and to banish all serious reflection. If then, "the Sabbath was made for man," for his benefit, it is rational to conclude that *that* evening would be appointed to be kept, which would be most convenient, and conducive to his spiritual interest and improvement. And now will not these considerations, and these numerous texts, adduced in favor of keeping Sabbath evening, outweigh, in the view of a candid mind, the three passages supposed to favour the keeping of Saturday evening? Two of these are in the Old Testament, and only one in the New, recorded by different evangelists, and not one after the institution of the Christian Sabbath. But as God reckons the evening *succeeding* the day as belonging to the day, and as the apostles observed that evening, if others are not satisfied that it belongs to the Sabbath, it fully satisfies the mind of MINIMUS.

WE cheerfully give the following inofficial review a place among our Religious Communications. It is in itself an acceptable miscellany, while its main object seems to be, to do justice to the memory of an injured name. What the unpleasant "circumstances" were, to which the writer, in the course of his remarks, takes occasion to allude, we have no distinct information; nor do we know what grounds might or might not have existence, to justify the "evil surmises" of which both he and the biographer of Doctor Parish complain, as so injurious to their deceased friend. It is a history with which we neither are, nor are solicitous to be, acquainted; and therefore we can have neither prejudice nor prepossession respecting it. But we cannot help expressing our surprise, that the author of such discourses as the Remarker introduces to our notice, should ever have fallen under "the suspicion of being a Unitarian." Indeed, had he merited this name, he had certainly deserved a worse one;

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

New Series.

VOL. I.] AUGUST, 1827. [No. VIII.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

REPLY TO MINIMUS ON THE COMMENCEMENT OF HOLY TIME.

IT was the practice of our ancestors to begin the Sabbath on Saturday evening at sunset. This they did on the ground that the Jews began their Sabbath at the same hour on Friday evening, and that the Christian Sabbath commenced one day later. And although many of their descendants have, in this as in other things, departed from their example, yet the alteration in the commencement of the Sabbath, and consequently in the night observed as holy time, has been defended on other grounds than that the Jews began their Sabbath at midnight. That question, indeed, I conceived to be set at rest. I thought that the Bible had decided it. I thought that the practice of our ancestors had decided it. For with whatever faults they might have been chargeable, whatever might have been the blindness of their zeal, their intolerance, or the repulsive sternness of their religious creed, no one has been fool-hardy enough to deny their vast acquirements on all subjects connected with Biblical science. And trained as they were to habits of patient investigation, and urged on by their love of the truth and the fervour of their religious feelings, it would be surprising if they had been unable to decide a question of such practical importance. But it seems that they were unable to decide it. And Minimus has now stepped forward to draw aside the veil which has hung over it for almost nineteen hundred years, and to chase away the mists which have darkened the eyes of the fathers of the Christian church. The universal agreement of commentators proves nothing, although it forms a chain of evidence reaching almost back to the commencement of the Christian era; the practice of the Jews since their dispersion proves nothing, although as a nation they are and ever have been, distinguished for the inveterateness of their prejudices against innovation. But what is the testimony brought forward to establish a claim which carries with it such prima facie evidence of its improbability? It consists in an assemblage of texts designed to prove that the evening *followed* the day instead of *preceding* it, and that the Jews commenced their civil day at midnight. These assuredly were facts which the Jewish writers must have known,—facts which must have been either directly or indirectly alluded to in the pages of almost every author. Strange then that a mistake so universal should have prevailed when

Digitized by Google

the means of refutation were so easy! Minimus should have accounted for the almost universal prevalence of this error, should have told us the probable causes which misled the Jews themselves on a subject regarding their own division of time; or he should have shown that the discrepancy supposed to exist between the scripture account and the writings of the Jews themselves did not exist. But as he has found it impossible, on his theory, to reconcile them, it is presumptive proof that that theory is incorrect. And this presumption will be strengthened, nay—it will amount to absolute certainty, upon a critical examination of the subject.

I propose to examine first the Jewish division of time, and then to show how all the texts quoted by Minimus can, on that division, be satisfactorily explained.

1. There were among the Jews three days of different lengths, or commencing at different times. The first was the natural day, consisting of twenty-four hours and reckoned from sunset to sunset. The second, called the artificial day, consisted of the time between sunrise and sunset. The third commenced with the first dawn of light and terminated in the afternoon. Afterwards, for the sake of an equable division of time, the last mentioned day and the artificial day began severally at three and six in the morning, and ended at those hours in the afternoon. The time between the evenings of those days was called *inter duas vesperas. Goodwin De Paschate.* That the last mentioned day did not commence at midnight is evident from Ex. xii. 29—31, compared with verse 22. For the Israelites were not to go out until the morning (ἕως πρωΐ,) which did not commence until after midnight. The Jews at first divided their night into three watches, but afterwards, imitating the Romans to whom they had become subject, they divided it into four, each of three hours length.*

2. The Jews commenced their civil day at sunset, reckoning the evening preceding the artificial day as belonging to the natural day.

This appears from the account of the creation given by Moses. Before the creation of light, 'darkness was upon the face of the deep.' And the works of the first day were, the creation of light, its separation from darkness, and the naming of the light and the darkness. The darkness, which he called night, must, therefore, have preceded the day, for it was named *previous* to the evening following the first day. Nor does the attempt of Minimus, to show that the time before sunrise is often called morning, at all lessen the force of this argument. For, according to the Jewish computation of time, as has been already shown, the time between the first dawn of light and sunrise is called morning. The argument is strengthened by the *repeated* mention of the evening first. For if the morning had commenced the day, such a collocation, to say the least of it, would have been awkward and unnatural.†

* Initio noctem secabant in tres vigilias, quarum quæque habebat quatuor horas. Hoc liquet ex Judicum 7th, ubi legitur Gideon ingressus fuisse in hostem media nocte, vigilia secunda. Secunda igitur vigilia erat in media nocte. Quare duæ aliæ extremæ partes, erant prima et tertia vigilia, quarum una vigilia vespertina, altera matutina vocabatur. Sed postea imitati Romanos, secuerunt noctem in quatuor vigilias: quarum quæque haberet tres horas sicut habemus apud Evangelistas. *Zanchius Tom. III. pages* 439, 440. Prima vocabatur ὀψὲ, sero. Secunda μεσονύκτιον, media nox. Tertia αλεκτοροφωνια, gallicinium. Quarta πρωΐ, mane. Nescitis quando herus venturus sit, ὀψὲ vesperi, ἢ μεσονυκτὶς aut media nocte, ἢ αλεκτοροφωνιας aut gallicinio, ἢ πρωΐ aut diluculo. (Marc. XIII. 35.) *Goodwin. Lib. III. page* 464.

†Insuper Moses vicissitudinem noctis di-

Digitized by Google

3. The Sabbath, as other days, commenced at six in the afternoon. But the preparation commenced at three, at which time the preceding day commencing with the dawn, terminated.* It was ushered in by the sound of a trumpet, which also sounded at its going out.† That the Sabbath ended at sunset is evident from the fact, that at the setting of the sun on Sabbath evening the Jews brought their sick to Christ that he might heal them. And the attempt of Minimus to prove that they did not consider the healing of the sick as a violation of the Sabbath, shows only the dilemma to which he is reduced. That they did so consider it may be inferred from Mark iii. 2. 'And they watched him whether he would heal on the Sabbath day; that they might accuse him.' And also from their own writers. 'Propter morbum quem medici periculosum habent, Sabbathum profanare licet, licet laboret ægrotus carnis aliqua exteriore parte. Si unus medicus affirmat morbum periculosum esse, alter vero negat, Sabbathum tamen profanatur.'

Having shown, I trust satisfactorily, from profane as well as sacred writers, the true division of Jewish time, I will now examine those of the arguments of Minimus which relate more *immediately* to the Sabbath. The first regards the time of the burial of Christ. "The account of the burial of Christ furnishes evidence that the Sabbath did not begin at sunset." For the evening after which 'Joseph went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus' could not mean the first evening which began at noon (three o'clock?) but the second which began at sunset. His arguments are not conclusive; for, the expression 'when the evening was come (ὀψίας γενομένης,) may denote the first evening. Scapula thus defines πρωΐ—ΠΡΩΙ, mane, cui oppon. ὀψέ, vesperi. It thus appears that ὀψία *may* denote either the evening of the day commencing at three in the afternoon, or the first watch of the night commencing at six. And the context shows that such *must* be the meaning. 'Because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath.' But according to Josephus as quoted supra, the preparation began at three in the afternoon. And according to Lightfoot the preparation began immediately after the evening sacrifice,* which, as will afterwards be shown, was sacrificed a little before three. It may be urged that the first evening cannot be meant, since Christ died at the commencement of this evening, and he had been a long time (πάλαι) dead. Our translators render πάλαι 'any while,' and Hedericus says, *dicitur de brevi tempore.*

The argument founded on Lev. xxiii. 32. "From even to even shall ye celebrate your sabbath,"

sique recensens constanter vesperæ sive noctis primo meminit, veluti v. 5. *et fuit vespera, et fuit mane dies primus* conf. v. 8, 13, 19, 23, 31, quod argumento est diem naturaliter subsequi. Hinc Judæi uti olim ita hodienum noctem tempori matutino præponunt. *Goodwin Lib. III. page* 462.

* Sabbathum incipit hora sexta vespertini pridie. Graeci id nuncupant παρασκοδον σαββατς. Preparatio Sabbathi erat hora tertia pomeridiana, quam Hebraei vocant vesperam Sabbathi. *Goodwin Lib. III. De Sabbatho.*

Neque cogi ad praestanda vadimonia sabbatis, aut pridie sabbatorum post horam nonam in paraseeue. *Flavii Josephi. Antiq. Judaei. Lib. XVI. chap.* 10.

† In omnibus provinciis atque urbibus Israelitarum vespera Sabbathi sextes clangebant.—Primus clangor edebatur in Mincha, tertia parte elapsa, quando sol jam occidebat. Ita quoque Sabbatho exeunte, stellis ortis, cum in finem clangebatur, ut quisque ad opera agenda licentiam acciperent. *Rambam Tract. Sabb. Chap.* 5.

* Vespera Sabbati, seu dies precedens, dies preparationis Sabbati appellabatur, Lucae, XXIII. 54, et a pomeridiano sacrificio et deinceps Sabbato se preparare coeperent &c. *Lightfoot Tom. II. page* 16.

Digitized by Google

is not invalidated by the objections of Minimus. Because, as has already been shown, the preparation of the sabbath commenced on the evening of the preceding day. And in the verse preceding, it is expressly stated that they were to begin the Sabbath on the evening of the ninth day. Therefore both evenings would be included. There is one other objection to the commencement of the sabbath on the preceding evening, founded upon John xx. 19, and going to prove that the evening *succeeding* the sabbath was kept as holy time. Might not the same reference, with equal justice, be drawn from the same practice of holding religious meetings on the evening *succeeding* the day, which is prevalent now among those who begin the sabbath on the preceding evening?

There remains now to be considered the Passover and those texts which relate to the *general* division of Jewish time. The substance of his argument founded upon the time of the celebration of the passover may be thus briefly stated. 'The children of Israel were commanded to kill the paschal lamb "at the going down of the sun" on the fourteenth day, and to eat it on the same day. But if the day ended at sunset, the paschal lamb could not have been eaten on the fourteenth day. Nor could that day be called with any propriety the first day of unleavened bread.' To this I reply

1. That the passover was celebrated on the evening of the fourteenth day. The lamb was sacrificed between evening and sunset after the daily sacrifice, and eaten in the night. Ex. xii. 8.* Hence Deut. xvi. 6, refers to this time, mentioning the commencement and the close,—"at evening, at the going down of the sun." That these two expressions do not refer to the same *point* of time, is not only evident from the parallel passage in Exodus but from the continuation of the sentence,—"at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt." The Israelites went from Egypt in the morning; the expression, therefore, must denote the preparation for their departure, not the precise time at which they left Egypt. But it stands in the same connexion as the other two expressions—"at even, at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt." They cannot, therefore, be interpreted literally as referring to the *same time*, but must denote generally the time of the sacrifice, and the preparation for their departure.

2. That the feast of unleavened bread was eaten on the fifteenth day, which was, therefore, with propriety called the first day of unleavened bread. But the preparation of the feast commenced on the evening preceding the fourteenth day with searching for leavened bread by the light of candles.* This search continued four hours after the rising of the sun, from which time until noon the leavened bread was destroyed.† As the paschal

* Tempus quo agnus mactari debuit, erat vespera. Ex. xii. 6. Sive, ut in originali textu, inter duas vesperas. *Goodwin de Paschate. page* 545.

Pascha non comeditur nisi noctu, neque comeditur nisi ad mediam usque noctem. *Talmud quoted by Lightfoot. Tom. I. page* 609.

Quotidianum sacrificium vespertinum mactandum fuisse antequam inciperent mactare pascha. Horas autem sic dividebant: mactabant quotidianum sacrificium hora octava et dimidia. Sed in preparatione paschatis id mactabant hora septima et dimidia, et offerebant hora octava et dimidia. *Lightfoot. Tom. I. page* 730.

* Luce diei decimae quartae investigant fermentum per lucem candelae. Nocte cui dies insequens est dies decimus quartus: atque adi omnes commentatores, et docebunt illi, hoc factum esse exeunte jam die decimo tertio. *Lightfoot. Tom. II. page* 458.

†Exterminatio seu conflagratio fermen-

Digitized by Google

lamb was sacrificed on the evening of the fourteenth day, and as the Jews were forbidden to offer the blood of sacrifice with leavened bread, Ex. xxiii. 18, they consequently abstained from the use of it on the afternoon of the fourteenth day, which might, therefore, not improperly be styled the first day of unleavened bread, although this was not eaten until the fifteenth day.* But the reason given by *Minimus* for calling the fourteenth day the first day of unleavened bread, is very unsatisfactory. For why should that day be called the first day of unleavened bread with any more propriety if it ended at midnight, than if it ended at sunset, if unleavened bread was not eaten until the fifteenth, and if they did *not* abstain from the use of leavened bread on the fourteenth,—a fact of which Minimus seems not to be aware? The view of the subject here given presents the only satisfactory explanation of these *seeming* contradictions.

1. Sam. xxx. 17, is another text referred to by Minimus to prove that the evening *generally* followed the day, and the last that I shall here notice. "And David smote them from the twilight (ἀπὸ ἑωσφόρου from the morning dawn) even unto the evening of the next day." Which is more probable that the battle lasted thirty six hours, or that it lasted twelve?

Since writing the above I have met with "Horne's Introduction," and have been agreeably surprised at the *exact* coincidence in the results to which we have arrived. This coincidence is a strong confirmation of their truth. Indeed however agreeable it may be to the feelings, or convenient to the interests of some, or how muchsoever it be fitted to promote a stricter observance of the Sabbath, the change of the evening is absolutely indefensible on the ground that Minimus has taken. Nor am I an advocate for accommodating the commencement of the Sabbath to the convenience of the worldly and irreligious. It is true that the "Sabbath was made for man," but this temporizing, accommodating policy has been carried too far. It ought to stand out from other days with a distinctive prominence. But, in the rage for innovation which is sweeping away the land marks of other ages, this too must be conformed to the spirit of an 'improved philosophy.' Our fathers in view of the positive injunctions of God, pleaded not convenience, but obeyed with alacrity and cheerfulness not only the *spirit* but the *letter* of the Law. But we their descendants have found it *inconvenient* to follow their example, and arguments must forthwith be collected to justify our departure from it.

Q. Q.

ti, quae facta a quarta ad sextam horam. *Goodwin. page* 555.

* Investigatio fermenti erat nocte diei decimæ quartae, quamvis comestio fermentati non prohiberatur ante meridiem diei decimæ quartae. *Rambam.*

Prohibitum est comedere fermentum die decimo quarto a meridie et porro, ab initio horae septimæ. *Maimonides quoted by Lightfoot. Tom I. page* 458.

EXPOSITION OF MATTHEW XI. 11.

Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. Mat. xi. 11.

This remarkable asseveration of Christ occurs twice in the evangelists; once in Matthew, as quoted, and also in Luke vii. 28. The passages are parallel, and very much the same in both places.

Perhaps no intelligent Christian has pondered the sentence, without sentiments of wonder and trouble—the one, in respect to the question, *what does the Saviour mean?* the other, because no satis-

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

New Series.

VOL. I.] NOVEMBER, 1827. [No. XI.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE OBLIGATION OF PIOUS YOUNG MEN OF PROPERTY, TO DEVOTE THEMSELVES TO THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

LEST the sentiments advanced in this paper should be thought to have a bearing upon Education Societies which is not intended, I beg leave to state explicitly that I am a decided friend of those societies which educate indigent young men, possessing the requisite qualifications, for the ministry. I rejoice in their success; and it is my fervent prayer and hope that their resources and efforts will continue to increase, until every spot upon the globe shall be furnished with a faithful minister of the Lord Jesus.

During a period of many years' observation, I have seen a considerable number of young men, pious and liberally educated, refusing to enter the ministry; and choosing in preference some secular profession. During the same period, I have seen a still greater number of young men, in whom talents and piety were apparently united, and who possessed ample means of obtaining a literary and theological education, neglecting to avail themselves of their advantages for becoming ministers of the gospel, and comparatively burying their talents in the active pursuits of business. As these instances of the rejection of the sacred ministry by persons apparently fitted to be useful in it have successively taken place before my eyes, I have felt the deepest regret—a regret which I doubt not has been felt in common by all who ardently desire the prosperity of the kingdom of Jesus. That it is the duty of all pious young men, possessed of property, irrespective of circumstances, to devote themselves to the ministry of the gospel, is not pretended. But that it is their duty generally, and always, where circumstances do not indicate that some other mode of serving their generation according to the will of God should be chosen in preference, I shall attempt to show. The considerations to be adduced will apply alike to those who have already obtained a literary education, and to those who have not, but possess the requisite means; and that too, whether they are in actual possession of property themselves, or have parents who are able to furnish it. It is admitted, however, that in those cases where they are dependent upon their parents, the parents themselves are primarily responsible.

The services which these young men may render in the ministry are needed. Much, comparatively very much, is doing for the diffusion

Digitized by Google

nestness he puts in requisition the means which God hath graciously appointed for its accomplishment. "Yet for all these things, I will be inquired of by the house of Israel."

But I cannot leave the subject here. The divine immutability we have seen is not inconsistent with the duty of prayer. I would now go farther, and affirm that it is itself the grand essential to our trust for all acceptance with God. In his infinite compassion he hath purposed that whosoever cometh unto him in sincerity, by repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, shall obtain everlasting life. And so of all the promises recorded in his word, whether pertaining to this life, or to that which is to come, he purposed from eternity to vouchsafe these blessings, whenever and wherever the conditions should be fulfilled. But were it once announced that the eternal purpose of God might change, with what confidence could we longer rely on these promises? And if his gracious designs should actually alter, it is most evident that all our hopes would be gone forever. Thus we see that the immutability of God lies at the foundation, not only of the inestimable privilege of prayer, but likewise of every other privilege and blessing and hope of the gospel. "I am the Lord; I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." J.

REPLY TO Q. Q. ON THE COMMENCEMENT OF HOLY TIME.

Theological discussions should ever be conducted with candor. The opinions of fallible men must be relied on no further than they accord with the sacred oracles. Different and opposite sentiments have been embraced by great and good men. The reformers, and our pious fore-fathers, embraced some sentiments, which their orthodox descendants now generally reject. I did not therefore deem it incumbent on me, as Q. Q. seems to imagine, to show why those, to whom he refers, observed Saturday evening as holy time, but simply to prove that the practice is not warranted by the word of God.

There are three, and only three, passages brought from the Bible, which it is pretended decide the question in his favor, and these I endeavored to show, afford no evidence that the Sabbath begins at sunset. How far I succeeded the reader will judge. I then, as he admits, "brought forward an assemblage of texts designed to prove that the evening *followed* the day." A great part of these texts, and my arguments and illustrations, he passed in entire silence. Where he attempted a reply, it will be my object to show how far he has succeeded. If "the practice of our ancestors decided it," as he says, then they must be infallible. If not, they must decide it by the Bible. Where then is their proof from the Bible? Has he produced it? Though they were great and good men, much light has been gained since their day. And if, as Q. Q. intimates, they universally began the Sabbath at sunset, there has been a very great change since, among the pious. And as this is "the era of light," and as light is advancing, we may hope that even before the millennium, all will see eye to eye in this respect, and be united in keeping holy Sabbath evening.

Q. Q. has named "the fathers of the Christian church" as his witnesses, but he has produced none of them. And although he affirms that in "the universal agreement of commentators he has an unbroken chain of evidence, reaching almost back to the commencement of the Christian era," he has shown us none of this chain for fifteen or sixteen centuries from the com-

Digitized by Google

mencement of the Christian era. This agreement, however, is by no means universal. I adduced the opinion of Pool, that learned commentator and distinguished critic, that the Jews began the day at midnight. And the same opinion is expressed by Vincent, in his explanation of the Assembly's catechism, which was recommended by forty divines, among whom were the celebrated Dr. Owen and Dr. Calamy. And if they had not agreed with the author, would they not have expressed their dissent, as is done in an edition published in New-Haven, where a note is subjoined, attempting to prove the incorrectness of the author's opinion?

Q. Q. places great dependance upon the authority of Jewish writers. What was the practice of the Jews, while they were God's people, we must learn from the holy Scriptures. For there are no other writings of Jews, till after they were rejected of God and blinded. As the Egyptians began the day at midnight,* we may suppose that the Israelites would conform to their practice, and, after they left Egypt, would do the same, unless expressly directed otherwise. And if, as Q. Q. says, "The Jews at first divided the night into three watches, but afterwards, imitating the Romans to whom they had become subject, they divided it into four," why might they not begin the day at sunset, in imitation of the Romans, who began it at sunset?† If they changed their manner of dividing the night, why might they not change the time of beginning the day?

Josephus lived and wrote among the Romans, and was accommodating and incorrect in his statements, as any one may see, who compares his writings with the Scripture history.

The grand authority of later Jews is the Talmud, consisting of twelve folio volumes, containing an explanation of their traditions. They prefer the Talmud to the holy Scriptures, though framed with almost the same imposture as the Alcoran of Mahomet."* Upon such authority, Q. Q., we may suppose, from his quotations and remarks, places great reliance. I will make some other quotations, which will tend to show how much regard ought to be paid to the practice of the Jews in determining what the Bible teaches respecting the observation of the Sabbath.

"In order to begin the Sabbath well, they wash their hands and faces, trim their hair, and pare their nails, beginning at the fourth finger, then going to the second, then the fifth, then the third, ending with the thumb. As soon as prayers begin in the synagogue, the departed souls spring out of the purgatorial flames, and have liberty to cool themselves in water while the Sabbath lasts; for which reason the Jews prolong the continuance of it as much as they can." A Jew may on the Sabbath "destroy a louse, but must not kill a flea. He must not wipe his hands with a cloth, or a towel, but may do it very lawfully with a cow's tail."† The Jewish writers have, by their fables and traditions "made void the law." And if Q. Q. had paid more attention to the oracles of God, and less to these fables, he would not have been led to contradict the Bible, as he has repeatedly done. The Bible teaches that the passover was killed and eaten on the fourteenth day of the month. Ex. XII. 6, 8. Numb. IX. 2. 3. and XXXIII. 3. Josh. V. 10. Ezra VI. 19. But he says it was killed on

* Encyclopedia, Art. Day.
† Idem.

* Miller's Works, Vol. 5. pp. 131, 132.
† Encyclopedia, Art. Sabbath.

Digitized by Google

the *fourteenth*, and eaten on the *fifteenth*. "The lamb was sacrificed between [the first] evening and sunset after the daily sacrifice, and eaten in the night." That is, it was killed before sunset on the fourteenth day, and eaten in the night following, which must be the fifteenth day, if the day began at sunset. As the passover was to be eaten on the fourteenth day in the evening or night following that day, this "amounts to absolute certainty," that the evening *following*, and not *preceding*, belonged to the day, and that the day did *not* begin at sunset.

The Bible teaches that the fifteenth day was the first day of unleavened bread, and that they put away leaven on that day, which was the first of the seven days of unleavened bread, or put it away, and began to eat unleavened bread the evening following the fourteenth day. Ex. xii. 15—18. xiii. 3—7. Lev. xxiii. 5, 6. But he says, "The preparation commenced on the evening *preceding* the fourteenth by searching for leavened bread by the light of candles. This search continued four hours after the rising of the sun, from which time until noon the leavened bread was destroyed." But where is there any Scripture for this? As he says "the preparation commenced at three,* did they begin to "search by the light of candles" three hours before sunset? When the Scriptures are so particular upon the passover, and the feast of unleavened bread, it is surprising that any should regard, or bring forward as authority, such Talmudical writings, which are so at variance with the Bible.

Q. Q. says that unleavened bread "was not eaten until the fifteenth day." But the Bible says it was eaten "on the fourteenth day at even:" Ex. xii. 15—18—"a fact of which I was aware;" though I was "*not* aware," that the Bible teaches that "they abstained from the use of leavened bread on the afternoon of the fourteenth day." But if they ate unleavened bread on the evening of that day, the reader is left to judge whether this "is a very unsatisfactory reason for calling the fourteenth day the first day of unleavened bread." Or if leavened bread was put away on the fourteenth, but unleavened bread was not eaten until the *fifteenth* day, whether this is a *more* satisfactory reason for calling the *fourteenth* day the first day of *unleavened* bread, as he seems to suppose.

He mentions three days among the Jews, the natural day, consisting of twenty-four hours, and the others, consisting of twelve hours each, and extending from three and six in the morning to those hours in the afternoon, and thinks "that the last mentioned day did not commence at midnight is evident from Ex. xii. 29—31, compared with verse 22." Perhaps he meant *first* mentioned day. For no one supposes that the day which began at three or at six, began at midnight. But those texts do not make it "evident" to my mind, that the Israelites did not commence their natural, or civil day, at midnight. Did the command not to go out till the morning imply that they must or would go precisely at the time, when the day began? Though it is evident that they did "go out at the door of their house" soon after midnight, and consequently that it was morning. Ex. xii. 29, 30, 33. I do not know, however, that the Bible mentions a day beginning at three in the morning, and ending at three in the afternoon.

My grand objection to the argument drawn from Gen. i. 5, that as the evening and morning included twenty-four hours, the evening must extend to sunrise, and the

*Dr. Clarke says "the preparation began about twelve."

Digitized by Google

morning to sunset, he has passed in silence, and has not attempted to show that the time from midnight to sunrise is ever called evening, or the time from noon to sunset, morning. All my proofs that the order of time is often in Scripture inverted, he has also overlooked. But he thinks that, if the evening succeeding belonged to the day, "the *repeated* mention of the evening first, to say the least of it, would have been awkward and unnatural." And as Japheth was "the elder," and Ham "the younger" of Noah's sons, must he not consider the *repeated*, and even uniform, mention of them by the inspired writers in this order, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, "to say the least of it, awkward and unnatural?"—more especially as Ham, upon whom the curse was pronounced, is *repeatedly* mentioned before his elder brother Japheth.

Q. Q. brings forward the *circumstance* of the Jews' bringing their sick to Christ when the sun was set, to prove that the Sabbath ended at sunset, without noticing one of the arguments, which I adduced, to prove that this was not the reason they brought them at that time. But if this "fact" made it "evident that the Sabbath ended at sunset," and I was "reduced to such a dilemma in attempting to prove that they did not consider the healing of the sick as a violation of the Sabbath," I should have thought that he might have produced some other evidence besides the mere fact that his malignant enemies "watched him whether he would heal on the Sabbath day; that they might accuse him." I should have thought he might have shown why, if they "considered the healing of the sick as a violation of the Sabbath," they spread abroad Christ's fame for doing it—why the *elders* of the Jews besought him to do it, and thus violate the Sabbath, Luke vii. 1—4. Mat. viii.. 5—16. Mark i. 21—32—why all his adversaries were ashamed for attempting, as they supposed, to maintain the sanctity of the Sabbath—why they sought false witnesses to put Christ to death, when they could easily prove that he healed on the Sabbath.

My second argument, founded on Neh. xiii. 16—19, and which "related *immediately* to the Sabbath," he did not notice.

In replying to my fourth, he did not notice one of the reasons, which I offered, to prove that the expression, "When the even was come," must mean the second evening, or sunset, to which reasons I would refer the reader. But he says it *must* denote either the first or second evening. This I admit. But he cannot infer, that it was the first evening, "because it was the preparation, that is the day before the Sabbath," unless he takes it for granted, that the Sabbath began at sunset, which is the very point for him to prove. He says the first evening began at three. Pool and Scott say it "began when the sun had passed the meridian." But if it were three, Christ did not expire till *after* three. I will add another reason. Would they have broken the legs of the thieves, while alive, that they might take them down. three hours before sunset, and before it was necessary to take them down.

Did he mean to intimate, as his words evidently imply, that in Lev. xxiii. 32, referring exclusively to to the day of atonement, it is "expressly stated that they were to begin the 'weekly' Sabbath on the *ninth* day?" If by "both evenings being included," he means to include the first evening, beginning, as he says, at three, then would not this prove that the Sabbath began at three?

My grand argument from John xx. 19, that the evening *following* the first day of the week is called the first day of the week, he wholly overlooked, which is rather

Digitized by Google

surprising, if he designed to meet the argument *fairly*.

As "the Lord's Supper was constantly celebrated by the primitive Christians on the Sabbath,"* I stated as proof, that the Christians met to celebrate the Lord's Supper at Troas on the evening following the first day of the week, which he left unnoticed.

Did he suppose that it was the design of "Minimus to prove that the evening *generally* followed the day," but not always?

Since writing my first essay, I have met with Vincent's explanation of the Catechism, "and have been agreeably surprised at the *exact* coincidence in the results to which we have arrived. This coincidence is a strong confirmation of their truth."

Though I did not attempt to prove any "change of the evening" of the Sabbath, but the contrary, yet I will now cheerfully submit it to the candid reader whether "the ground that Minimus has taken is absolutely indefensible."

Whether Q. Q's. implied charge against those, who differ from him, of "a rage for innovation, temporizing and accommodating policy, accommodating the commencement of the Sabbath to the convenience of the worldly and irreligious, &c." is calculated to convince, or is consistent with that meekness and candor, which ought to guide all religious controversy, I leave to others to decide. I doubt not that the pious, who differ from me on this subject, are conscientious. And I should regret to wound their feelings. And if my cause cannot be supported by fair arguments, without casting reproach upon them, let it fall. MINIMUS.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

Sir,

Your correspondent, Paterfamilias, has in your number for August,

*Encyclopedia.

discussed the propriety of the common practice of performing two distinct religious services at meals. As his style seems to invite further discussion, perhaps the following remarks will not be wholly inappropriate.

His objections to performing two services are five, viz; That two are not essential, nor conformable to the nature of the duty; that the second is a repetition of the first; that it is an unprofitable multiplication of religious services: is inconvenient; and not agreeable to the practice of Christ, and the ancient people of God. I shall attempt to show that none of these objections are valid.

1. That two services are not essential is admitted. But if we proceed on the principle of doing nothing which is not essential, we shall confine Christian practice within narrow limits. It is not essential that there be *any* service at the table. The whole of supplication and thanksgiving might be included in the morning prayer, and every service at meals, and also the evening sacrifice, might be omitted. Or the object might be effected in a different way. Whenever we make any considerable provision beforehand, of food or drink, we might give thanks to God for it, and, if such a request should be judged proper, might implore a blessing on its consumption. He who should conscientiously do either of these, would, no doubt, do all that is essential. No one could say that he had not a sense of his dependence on God, and of his obligation to him for life and all its enjoyments. We act on a different principle.

But that two services are not conformable to the nature of the duty, is not admitted. We are not to be confined to the formulas* of the Talmud, nor to the senti-

* "Blessed be thou, O Lord our God! Sovereign of the universe! who bringest forth this food from the earth," *or, as the case might be,* "this wine from the grape."

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF GENTLEMEN.

FOR THE YEAR

1828.

NEW SERIES.——VOL. II.

New-Haven,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY DURRIE, PECK, & CO.

PUBLISHED ALSO BY JOHN P. HAVEN, NEW-YORK.

THE

CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

New Series.

VOL. II.] MAY, 1828. [No. V.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

ON THE COMMENCEMENT OF HOLY TIME.

I HAVE read with considerable interest what has been published of late in the Christian Spectator, respecting the time when the Sabbath begins. This subject, though not of so much importance as some others, is nevertheless one on which it is desirable that our minds should be settled. Having recently paid some attention to it, the following is communicated as the result of my inquiries.

In ascertaining when the Sabbath begins, it is of no small importance to have correct and definite views of the word *evening* or *even*, as used in the sacred writings. The word more generally is used to denote the commencement of darkness, or sunset. But it is sometimes used to denote a part of what we call the afternoon, viz. the period from three o'clock to sunset. This is a point which we think it proper to establish. From Num. xxviii. 4, we learn that one lamb was to be offered in the morning and another at even. This direction was given in reference to the morning and evening sacrifice. Now can it be ascertained at what time the evening sacrifice was offered? In the Acts of the Apostles iii. 1, we read that Peter and John went up into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour. The Jews, it should be remembered, reckoned their hours from morning to night making twelve in the day. The ninth hour, then, or three o'clock P. M. was the hour of prayer at the temple. But there was no stated hour of prayer at the temple except when the morning and evening sacrifice was offered. That their seasons of sacrifice were also seasons of prayer is evident from Luke i. 10. "And the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense." Indeed, such was the connexion between sacrifice and prayer under the Jewish dispensation that the former is sometimes used for the latter, as in Prov. xv. 8. From a comparison of the above passages I think it may be clearly inferred, that the evening sacrifice was offered at three o'clock P. M. On this point, so far as I know, all commentators are agreed.

To the same result, we are brought from a comparison of Matt. xiv. 15, with 23. "And when it was evening, his disciples came to him saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past, send the multitude away that they may go into the villages and buy themselves vituals," &c. 23d verse, "And when he had sent the multitudes away, he went up into a mountain apart to pray; and when the evening was come, he was there alone." Observe, it was evening before the multitudes were fed; and after feeding them and sending away his disciples, and also the mul-

Digitized by Google

titude, and going himself into the mountain, the evening came. Here are *two evenings* spoken of after the hour was past, that is as I suppose, the hour of dining or refreshment. When did the first of these commence? Immediately after midday? or not till some time in the afternoon? Not immediately after midday; first, because at that time the multitudes could not have been in so suffering a state for food, as to excite the compassion of the disciples; secondly, because Mark tells us, vi. 35, that when the disciples came to Christ, the day was *far* spent, and the time *far* passed. But would the day be said to be far spent and the time far passed immediately after midday? But if we suppose the first evening to have commenced at three o'clock P. M. we can account for the compassion of the disciples for the hungry multitude, and see the propriety of the expressions used by Mark, "the day was far spent," and "the time now far passed."

In the opinion here offered, I am supported by the following commentators and lexicographers.

The Assembly in their annotations Matt. xiv. 15, on the word evening, say, "That is, the first evening, when the sun was much declined, about three o'clock P. M., and the second evening, verse 23, which began at sunset."

Campbell on Matt. xiv. 23, says, let it be observed, for the sake of removing this difficulty, (viz. between this and the 15 verse) that the Jews spoke of two evenings; the first was considered as commencing from the ninth hour, that is, in our reckoning, at three o'clock P. M., and the second from the twelfth or sunset. This he adds, appears from several passages in the Old Testament. In the institution of the passover, for instance, the people are commanded to kill the passover at evening, Hebr. *between the evenings*, that is, between three and six o'clock P. M.

McKnight on Matt. xxviii. 1, observes, "As the Jewish day began at sunsetting, they distinguished the evening into two parts. The first being the evening on which the preceding day ended; and the second the evening with which the new day began. Hence the expression in the institution of the passover, Exod. xii. 6, between the two evenings. Compare also Matt. xiv. 15 with 23, where both evenings are mentioned. The first evening was the space from three in the afternoon to sunsetting; the second began at sunsetting and lasted till nine."

Schleusner, on the word ὀψιος, after referring to the Hebrew, which is rendered between the evenings, says, "One was from the ninth hour of the day, our three o'clock P. M. until the setting of the sun; the other was from the last hour of the day until the beginning of night,"* (or entire darkness.)

Calmet on the word *passover*, says, "The paschal lamb was to be killed between the two evenings, that is, between the sun's decline and his setting, or rather according to our reckoning, between three o'clock P. M. and six o'clock in the evening."

Brown on the word *even*, says, "It is when it begins to grow dark, or at least when the sun is considerably declined," and adds "the passover was killed between the evenings about three o'clock P. M. when the sun was half declined."

There is no evidence which I have seen that the word evening is in the scriptures ever applied to the portion of time immediately succeeding midday; but there is evidence that it is applied to the latter part of the afternoon, or from three o'clock till sunset.

* "Una fuit ab hora diei nona, nostra tertia pomeridiana, usque ad solis occasum; altera, ab hora diei ultima, cum sol occidit, usque ad noctis principium."

Digitized by Google

I am now prepared to examine some of the passages which are brought to prove that the evening succeeding the day, even every day, is a part of it, and consequently that the evening succeeding the Sabbath is a part of the Sabbath.

One passage brought for this purpose is Lev. xxiii. 27, "Also on the tenth day of this seventh month, there shall be a day of atonement," compared with the 32d verse, "In the ninth day of the month at even." It is said that the evening preceeding the day of atonement is called the evening of the ninth, whereas if the day had begun at sunset, it would have been the evening of the tenth.

This difficulty is at once obviated by keeping in mind the two evenings; the first commencing at three o'clock and terminating at sunset, the second beginning at sunset and extending till nine o'clock, or through the first watch of the night. The ninth day at even therefore was the ninth day before sunset. When the ninth day closed, the tenth day, or day of atonement commenced according to the commandment,—"from even to even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath." It should not be forgotten that every day, according to the Jewish reckoning, began and ended with an evening. It began with the second and ended with the first.

Another passage is Exod. xii. 6, "And ye shall keep it, (that is the lamb) until the fourteenth day of the same month; and the whole assembly of the congregation shall kill it in the evening." It is said "if the fourteenth day began at sunset, then the evening would be the evening following the thirteenth, and the first day of unleavened bread would be the fourteenth day. But it was the fifteenth day." This reasoning is also set aside by the consideration of two evenings. The passover was killed on the fourteenth day at even, or between three and six o'clock P. M.; and the next day commencing at sunset would be the fifteenth day, or first day of unleavened bread.

Another passage is Matt. xxvii. 57, "When the evening was come, there came a rich man of Arimathea named Joseph, who also was Jesus' disciple. He went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus." It is affirmed that if the Sabbath "had begun at sunset, Christ's prediction must have failed that he should be three days and three nights, or a part of three days (according to the Jews' manner of reckoning) in the heart of the earth, or in the tomb." A recollection of the two evenings will at once remove the difficulty in question. It was after the first evening had commenced, and probably not long after the death of Christ, when Joseph came to Pilate; as Pilate had not heard of his death and marvelled that he expired so soon. As therefore Joseph obtained the body soon after the commencement of the first evening, there would be time to put it in the sepulchre before sunset, though as I shall have occasion to observe hereafter, the approaching Sabbath accelerated the funeral solemnities.

Another text adduced to show that the evening succeeding the Sabbath is a part of it, is John xx. 19, "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut," &c. It is claimed that the evening after the Sabbath is spoken of as being a part of it. But whether the evening in this passage means the first or second evening, does not, for certainty, appear from the circumstances stated. One of the evangelists, it is true, says it was toward evening, and that the day was far spent, when Christ and the two disciples went in to tarry, on the road to Emmaus. But a similar phraseology is used by Mark vi. 35, in reference, as has been shown, to the first evening. And if the first evening be meant, then the meeting of the disciples was

Digitized by Google

before sunset, and consequently the passage furnishes no argument that the evening after the Sabbath was a part of it. But if the second evening should be thought to be the one referred to, the argument derived from the passage may be removed by the consideration that the apostle John, as he wrote his gospel after the destruction of the Jewish polity and for the benefit of the whole Roman empire, is supposed to have used sometimes the form and division of time in use among the Romans, who began their day at midnight. As evidence of this fact compare what Mark and John say respecting the time of Christ's crucifixion. Mark (xv. 25) says, "It was the third hour and they crucified him." John (xix. 14) says, (and the declaration was made before Pilate delivered Jesus into the hands of the Jews) "It was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour." If John's division of time was the same as that of Mark's, it would be impossible to reconcile them; since according to Mark, Christ was hung upon the cross more than three hours before he was delivered up to be crucified according to John. But upon the supposition that John followed the Roman division of time, the accounts are easily reconciled. It was six o'clock A. M. when Pilate brought Jesus forth, and sat down upon the pavement; and it was the third hour or nine o'clock A. M. according to Mark when he was suspended upon the cross. The events which took place in the meantime would probably require the space of three hours. Now upon the supposition that John followed the Roman mode of reckoning time in the passage under consideration, it furnishes no evidence that, according to the directions which God gave to the Jews respecting the Sabbath, or even in the opinion of John himself, the evening after it made a part of it. In this case he was in the same situation with a man in this country who keeps Saturday night. While *his* Sabbath ends at sunset, in accommodation to the custom of others, he speaks of the evening after the Sabbath, as if it belonged to the day. Thus nothing is more common than to hear such an one speaking of what he did or where he went on the evening of the Sabbath, or Sabbath evening. But to infer from this phraseology, that he considered Sabbath evening holy time, would be as unwarrantable as to infer that a man believed the sun rolled round the earth merely because he spoke of his rising and setting.

In connexion with these remarks, I would take notice of an argument in favor of Sabbath evening, derived from the practice of the primitive Christians, who, it is said, used to meet for the celebration of the Lord's supper on that evening. That such may have been the fact will not be denied; but it is doubted whether any such fact can be found in the records of the New Testament. It is indeed said of the disciples at Troas, (Acts xx. 7) that they came together on the first day of the week to break bread. What part of the day it was their intention to break bread does not appear. But the fact is, that bread was not broken at that time, on any part of the Sabbath. Paul on this occasion was preaching to the church, and continued his speech until midnight. After this he raised the young man to life, who had fallen from a window. After all this had passed, and the people had returned again to the chamber of worship, the apostle broke bread or administered the Lord's supper. Now allowing that the Sabbath included the evening after the day, and extended until midnight, still it did not embrace the time in which the sacrament of the supper was administered. This was not done till sometime after midnight and consequently not till after the Sabbath was past, even in the opinion of all. Nor do I recollect any

Digitized by Google

instance, except the one now referred to, at Troas, in which it is positively certain that the disciples of Christ were ever assembled for public worship on Sabbath evening. And this, it should be remembered, was not an ordinary occasion. The great apostle himself was with them, ready to depart on the morrow; and so interesting was their meeting that they continued it not merely through the evening but until the very dawn of the next day. But though there be no evidence from the scriptures that the primitive Christians were in the habit of meeting on Sabbath evening for religious worship, it is not unlikely that they did so. Sabbath evening has ever been considered an evening very favorable to the holding of religious meetings. Labor is not expected of servants and domestics, nor usually performed by any, even if they keep Saturday night. Besides, people are then generally dressed in their better apparel, and therefore can attend meeting with less exertion and sacrifice than on other evenings. But if it could be made to appear that the apostles and primitive Christians met every Sabbath evening for religious worship, it would not, that I can see, furnish a shadow of evidence that they considered it holy time. Within the limits of my acquaintance, people who keep the evening before the day, are as much, if not more, in the practice of attending meetings on Sabbath evening, than those who keep the evening after. The writer of this article has attended a religious meeting on Sabbath evening, with a few exceptions, for more than twenty years; and yet he never dreamed that he was thus furnishing evidence of his belief that this evening is holy time.

Leaving the argument from Scripture, it is claimed in favor of the observance of Sabbath evening, that it is better calculated to promote the spiritual good of men. This argument, I think must be founded on the presumption that Sabbath evening is better remembered and kept than Saturday evening. It is indeed to be deplored that some who profess to keep Saturday night allow their business to drive them into their Sabbath. And it is a matter of equal lamentation that some who pretend to keep Sabbath night give and receive visits on that evening, as frequently perhaps as any other evening in the week. Without entering into a minute consideration of all that has been said on this part of the subject in favour of Sabbath night, I must be allowed to express my conviction that, as a general fact, those who keep the evening before the day, spend more time in religious duties than those who keep the evening after. I have already remarked that those who regard Saturday evening as holy time, usually spend Sabbath evenings in religious worship. It may therefore be presumed that they spend it, thus far, as devotionally and as much to the promotion of their spiritual good as those who actually deem it a part of holy time. In addition to this, they devote Saturday evening, more or less, not to say exclusively, to the duties of piety, while those who differ from them are engaged as usual in their secular concerns. Taking all these things into the account, it is believed that Saturday evening is as favorable to the growth of grace and the promotion of vital godliness as Sabbath evening.

Having examined the principal arguments urged in favor of the observance of Sabbath evening, it will be my object now to establish the opposite opinion. This I shall attempt to do, *first* from the testimony of the Scriptures; and *secondly* from the testimony of writings uninspired.

The Scriptures furnish testimony on this subject. We quote first Levit. xxiii. 32. "From even to even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath." This passage furnishes direct and positive proof that the Israelites began the tenth day of atone-

Digitized by Google

ment, and by parity of reasoning, unless this can be proved to be an exception, all their other days at even. It has I know been said that "from even to even," includes both the evening before and the evening after the day. It is a sufficient refutation of this opinion, that the Israelites were required to keep but one day sacred, and that was the tenth. If the words "from even to even," included more than one day, or twenty-four hours, then they were required to keep holy a part of another day besides the tenth, which is inconsistent with the whole testimony of the scriptures on this subject.

It has also been thought by some that the passage now under consideration implies an exception to the customary mode of beginning time; since if the other days of the Israelites began at even it was unnecessary to be thus particular in this instance. But the ground of this particularity is to be sought not in their ignorance of the time when the tenth day, or day of atonement would commence; but in their unwillingness to keep it holy. It is well known that they were prone to profane their weekly Sabbath; but it was probably foreseen by him who gave them this commandment that they would be still more prone to profane this occasional one. Hence, in the context, they are repeatedly prohibited from doing any labor on this day, and lest they should clip from the ends of it, as many do from the Sabbath at the present day, he reminds them when to begin, and how long to keep it. As if he had said, "It is not enough to keep a part of this day merely; the whole of it must be sacredly observed. You must begin in the ninth day, at even, or at the termination of the ninth day, and continue the observance one day or until evening returns again."

Another text which we quote in proof of the observance of Saturday evening, is Neh. xiii. 19, "And it came to pass when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark before the Sabbath, I commanded that the gates should be shut, and charged that they should not be opened till after the Sabbath." To invalidate the argument derived from this passage, it has been said that the gates of Jerusalem were darkened *before* the Sabbath, and therefore, the Sabbath could not have begun at sunset. It should be remembered, however, that there were high mountains on the west of Jerusalem, which concealed the sun from the inhabitants of that city before it was hid from the inhabitants of the region generally. It was after Jerusalem was overshadowed by these mountains that Nehemiah ordered the gates to be shut, even while the sun was still shining in some other places, and before the Sabbath was actually begun. This is no fancy of mine. It is the opinion of the critics and commentators. Take the learned Pool's opinion as a specimen of the rest.

"Then began the solemnity of the Sabbath, Lev. xxiii. 32, viz. when the sun had verged to its setting, a little season only before the Sabbath, because he was sooner hid from their sight on account of the opposite mountains."*

If then Nehemiah ordered the gates of Jerusalem to be shut as they began to be darkened by approaching night, does it not afford strong presumptive evidence that, in his day, the evening before the Sabbath was considered as holy time.

Another passage is found in the prophet Ezekiel, xlvi. 1, 2. "Thus saith the Lord God, The gate of the inner court that looketh towards the East shall be shut, the six working days, but on the Sabbath, it shall be opened, and in the day of the new

* Tunc incipiebat Sabbati solemnitas, Leviticus xxiii. 32, i. e. cum sol vergeret ad occasum tempestive admodum ante Sabbatum; quin sol propter adversos montes celerius illorum conspectui occultabatur."—*Pool in loco.*

Digitized by Google

moon it shall be opened. And the Prince shall enter by the way to the porch of that gate without, and shall stand by the posts of the gate, and the priest shall prepare his burnt-offering and his peace-offerings, and he shall worship at the threshhold of the gate, there he shall go forth :— but the gate shall not be shut until the evening."

Here it is expressly declared that the gate of the temple should be shut during the six working days ; and open on the Sabbath and on the day of the new moon. Now, let it be remarked, that this gate was shut at even, at which time the Sabbath or feast day ended, and the six working days began. And if the Sabbath ended at evening, it must of course have commenced at evening, which is the point to be proved.

In proof of the same point, we refer to Mat. vii. 16, "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils ; and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick." The evening here spoken of must have been the second evening, as Mark and Luke, both of whom record the fact, tell us, it was at the setting of the sun that the sick were brought to Christ. But why were not the sick brought to Christ before sunset ? Why, but because being Sabbath, it was contrary to the tradition of the Jews to heal on that day ? Hence they repeatedly complained of Christ for doing this. In proof of this assertion, hear the Evangelists. Mat. xii. 10, "And behold there was a man who had his hand withered, and they asked him saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath ? that they might accuse him." Luke xii. 14, says, "And the ruler answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the Sabbath day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work ; in them therefore, come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath day." John v. 16, says, "And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the Sabbath day." Also 18 v. "Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he had not only broken the Sabbath, but said that God was his Father." From these passages, is it not plain that the Jews considered it wrong and a violation of their law to attend to the healing of the sick upon the Sabbath ; and consequently that the influence of their rulers would naturally be exerted to prevent the sick from being brought to Christ while the Sabbath continued ? But this influence of their rulers would cease to be exerted after the close of the Sabbath. It evidently did so, after the setting of the sun, as the people then brought their sick to him, without any fear or restraint, from any quarter.

But it has been said that the Jews did not, after all, deem it unlawful to heal on the Sabbath ; and in support of this opinion, it is affirmed that the elders requested Christ to heal the centurion's servant on this day. After close investigation, I am unable to find any evidence of this fact. Luke, it is true, tells us that the elders besought Christ to heal the centurion's servant. But it is contended by some able commentators, that the centurion mentioned by Luke is not identical with the one mentioned by Matthew. If so, there is not the most distant hint, that the request of the elders was made on the Sabbath. And even allowing the centurions to be the same, I can find no evidence that the centurion's servant was healed on the Sabbath. The mere fact that it is narrated in connexion with the healing of Peter's wife's mother (and this is the only appearance of evidence in the case) proves nothing ; since the proximity of events, as might be shown in numerous instances in the Evangelists, is not according to proximity of narration.

Luke xxiii. 54, is a passage too important to be overlooked. "And that day was the preparation, and

Digitized by Google

the Sabbath drew on." The word here translated "drew on," literally, and in its original signification means to dawn, or enlighten by the removal of darkness. But this cannot be its meaning here. For, in the first place, the Sabbath dawned soon after the burial of Christ, which could not have taken place till toward the setting of the sun. Secondly, the Sabbath dawned at the close of the preparation. When the preparation ended, the Bible no where informs us; but Josephus and other writers on Jewish customs, say it began at three o'clock P. M. and ended at sunset. At this time there could have been no dawn in the literal sense of the word. If any should still think that the word is to be understood literally, and that it refers to the rising light of the coming day, they should be reminded that there is no dawning at midnight, the time when those who keep Sabbath evening usually begin the day. Besides, it is not said in the verse under consideration that the Sabbath was *about* to dawn, but that it had dawned. The word translated "drew on," is in the past tense, (επεφωσκε) dawned.

Whatever idea therefore be attached to it, it was something that had begun to take place. But though, as I have remarked, the word, in its primary meaning, signifies to dawn, or make light by the dissipation of darkness, yet it is sometimes used to denote the beginning of a thing, as in English, the dawn of life denotes the beginning of life, and the dawn of reason the beginning of reason. So, in the passage before us, when Luke tells us that the Sabbath drew on, or dawned, his meaning is, that it had then just begun. If then the Sabbath began soon after the body of Christ was laid in the grave, and at the close of the preparation, does it not prove conclusively that the evening before, and not the evening after belonged to the day?

The *haste* manifested in the crucifixion and burial of Christ is a proof that the Sabbath was nearer than midnight. John says, xix. 31, "Because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross upon the Sabbath day (for that Sabbath was an high day) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away." 41 v. "Now in the place where he was crucified, there was a garden, and in the garden a sepulchre. There laid they Jesus, therefore, because of the Jews' preparation, for the sepulchre was nigh at hand." Why did the Jews request that the legs of the Saviour and of the malefactors might be broken? To hasten their death, that they might be taken from the cross before the Sabbath. But if the Sabbath did not begin till midnight, why this haste? There were no less than eight or nine hours before its arrival. Why too, was the body of Christ put into the sepulchre that was in the garden where he was crucified, which was new, and in an unfinished state? Because it was, "nigh at hand." They had not time it would seem, to convey it elsewhere. But if the Sabbath did not begin till midnight there was no need of this haste. Since the Saviour died at three, P. M. there was abundant time to have conveyed his body to any burying place in Jerusalem. It will not be said that the Jews by this haste wished to avoid the darkness of the approaching night: for those whose opinion I am opposing say that Christ was not buried till after sunset; at which time it was as dark or more so, (since it was full moon,) than at any time before midnight. To me, it seems impossible to account for the haste discovered in the crucifixion and burial of Christ, but upon the supposition that the Sabbath began at sunset.

To the passages already adduced, we add another, Mat. xxvii. 62. 63, 64. "Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and pharisees came to-

Digitized by Google

gether unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead, so the last error shall be worse than the first." When, I would inquire, did the chief priests and Pharisees go to Pilate beseeching him to secure the sepulchre? Was it, on the evening of the day after his crucifixion, or not till after the night had passed away? If the former—then the Jewish Sabbath began with the evening before the day, since they came to Pilate on the next day that followed the preparation. If the latter—then the chief priests and Pharisees, with all their fear lest the disciples should steal the body of Jesus by night, left the sepulchre at least for one night, unsecured and unguarded without any conceivable reason for such neglect. "To have delayed" (that is, to guard the sepulchre) says McKnight, "till sunrising would have been preposterous, as the disciples might have stolen the body away during the preceding night."

Thus far the testimony of the scriptures.—We pass secondly to the testimony of writings uninspired.

And here time would fail me to make extracts from all the writers on Jewish antiquities, who have given their testimony to this point. A very few must suffice.

Calmet says, "The Hebrews began their day in the evening, the Babylonians at sunrise, the Romans at midnight."

Josephus, in the fourth book of his wars, informs us that a tower was erected, in which one of the priests stood and gave signal beforehand with a trumpet, at the beginning of every seventh day in evening twilight, and also in the evening when the day was finished, as giving notice when the day was finished, and when they were to go to work again."

Jahn, in his Archaeology, says, "The Hebrews, in conformity with the Mosaic law, reckoned the day from evening to evening." Every commentator on the Bible without exception, so far as I know, expresses the same opinion.* Now it should be remembered; that these commentators were under no temptation to force the scriptures from their obvious meaning, in order to make them speak a languge in conformity to their own practice; for their entire practice, I believe, has been to keep Sabbath evening as holy time. "It must be owned," says McKnight, "that our Sabbath is not precisely the day of the week, which the primitive Christians observed as their Sabbath. Their first day of the week, and consequently their Sabbath, began on Saturday evening, at sun-setting."

How, I ask, can any historical fact be proved? How, for instance, can you prove that there was ever such a sport among the Romans as was denominated the "shows of the gladiators?" If every writer of Roman history is found to declare the fact, and to relate many circumstances respecting the manner of its performance, would not the fact be considered as established? Now setting aside the Bible, let us inquire what evidence there is, that the Jews began their Sabbath at evening? All their own writers, in the first place, assert the fact; and the assertion

*Pool, I am sensible, has been claimed as an exception. I have consulted him, with a view to ascertain his opinion; and find it in accordance with the opinion expressed already on the passage in Nehemiah xiii. 19.

On Lev. xxiii. 32, he says, "Hebraei a sole occaso diem incipiebant."

On Mat. viii. 16, his note is "Addit Marius, cum Sol jam occidisset, exiissetque jam Sabbatum quod finiebatur vespera, sive sole occidente. Dum Sabbatum adesset, duxerunt illicitum aegrotos sanare."

Digitized by Google

is followed with corresponding practice. Dispersed, as they now are, over the whole earth, they unite in beginning their Sabbath at sunset, or as some of the Rabbins assert, the sun half an hour high. Nor is there the least intimation, from any quarter, that their practice, in this respect, has ever been changed.

Other writers, also, best acquainted with the customs and practices of this nation, unite in their testimony to the same fact. There is not, to my knowledge, a single exception. Now, the Bible out of the question, was any historical fact ever better supported than this? The Bible, I acknowledge to be of supreme authority. If it be obviously and decidedly opposed to the fact in question, it ought certainly to be rejected. But is it thus opposed? Let the whole host of commentators, of whatever name or sect, decide. Here allow me to refer to the supposed origin of the practice of observing Saturday evening as holy time in New-England. When our forefathers left their native country, they kept, as is believed, Sabbath night. For this is the night uniformly observed by all the churches of England and Scotland, whether they be dissenters, or of the establishment. But the first information we have of their practice relative to this subject is, that they were strict in the observance of Saturday evening. How is the change to be accounted for? On coming to this country, they determined to divest themselves, as far as possible, of the rites and practices of the church in which they had been educated, and come unprejudiced to the naked Bible and form a church whose principles and practices should be according to its perfect model. Hence originated the observance of Saturday evening as holy. The custom of beginning the day at midnight is derived from the Romans, and finds not a particle of support in the oracles of God.

This our forefathers doubtless perceived, and therefore rejected it, at least so far as it regarded the Sabbath. Being still in subjection to the mother country, they reckoned their civil days as before.

The Bible, then, so far from militating against the historical fact, that the Jews kept the evening before the Sabbath as a part of it, has proved the very source from whence the fact has been obtained.

There are some who claim that the evening succeeding the Sabbath is holy time not because the Jews kept the evening after the day, but because they suppose that under the gospel dispensation, there is not only a change of the day, but a change as to the time of beginning it. Their idea is, that as the Sabbath is now kept in commemoration of Christ's resurrection, it ought not to commence, till after that event took place. In reply to this, I would say, in the first place, that it is perhaps impossible to determine the precise time when Christ arose. In the second place, I would say, if it could be determined, there is no reason why the Sabbath should begin at that particular time. A whole day is set apart to commemorate the event of Christ's resurrection. But of what consequence is it whether that event happened at the beginning, or in the middle, or at the close of that day? Who ever thought it important to a right celebration of the independence of our country, to begin the celebration at the precise time of day that the Declaration was made?

Of all that we have said, this then is the sum—that the Jews began their Sabbath at sunset, and ended it at sunset,—and that as we keep the first instead of the last day of the week, our Sabbath consequently begins where theirs ended.

INVESTIGATOR.

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

New Series.

VOL. II.] JULY, 1828. [No. VII.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THE IMPORTANCE OF MULIPLYING THE LABORS OF WELL QUALIFIED AND FAITHFUL EVANGELISTS.

(*Continued from p.* 296.)

I SHALL proceed in this paper, in the first place, to a consideration of some of the disadvantages of the pastoral office and relations, in the existing forms. And in my statements on this subject, I shall endeavor to be conformed to the state of facts, so far as I have experienced and observed them. And I deem it fair to conclude, that the pastoral office, on the grand scale, is not likely to accomplish more than what it has done, so long as it exists and acts only in its present forms.

And, first, I observe, the existence of a *civil contract*, between a minister and his people, specifying and securing his salary, so called, is a disadvantage to his influence. Not that such a contract is improper, or inexpedient;—nor, that it is not, on the whole, the least of several evils. I wish not to be considered as deciding this question, either one way or the other. It is my object at this time simply to show, that there is a large field of influence left to the evangelist, which never is, and never can be reached, by the settled salaried minister.

Does a minister know, that he is a salaried man?—So certainly does he feel a repressing, a binding, a limiting influence. He may be a good pastor, he may have a great deal of influence, and do a great deal of good;—but it is morally impossible that he should pray, or preach, or act, or do any thing, with that freedom, independence, and moral force, which would doubtless characterise the same man, were he exempt from this disadvantage. And besides, to feel that one is provided for for life, takes away one of the most powerful incentives to vigorous action.

And will not the people too be influenced by such considerations?—It is impossible it should be otherwise. Some are entirely excluded from all the salutary influences of the gospel by such a fact; others say, 'it is their trade;' and there is not one in the whole parish, who can bring himself to feel, under the official ministrations of his pastor, that he is now listening to a man of God, whose attitude waits for obedience to his message, or upon condition of non-compliance, is ready to shake off the dust of his feet, and turn himself to more hopeful objects. He knows that such is not the fact. He may respect the gospel and esteem its minister; but he does not feel the urgency of im-

Digitized by Google

COMMENCEMENT OF HOLY TIME.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

I HAVE read with pleasure the ingenious remarks of your correspondent *Investigator*, in your number for May; and if I cannot adopt his conclusion it is not because I am at variance with his premises. He has shown satisfactorily to my mind that the Jewish Sabbath commenced at sunset; but does it follow that the Christian Sabbath should so begin? To establish the affirmative of this question, it is indispensable to show that such is the precise injunction of the *moral* law. But no one will pretend that the fourth commandment, in consecrating a seventh part of time, prescribes the exact hour when it shall commence. The command, "from even to even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath," was a subsequent regulation, local in its nature, evidently a part of the *ceremonial* law, and consequently must have ceased to operate at the introduction of the Christian dispensation. Accordingly, as your correspondent proves for another purpose, the apostle John, who wrote his gospel after the destruction of the Jewish polity, "adopted the Roman division of time;" and no doubt the entire Christian church at that period followed his example. For, as the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ is intended for the whole world, so its doctrines and precepts and ordinances are adapted to the diversified condition of the human race. Now how can an inhabitant of the frigid zone observe a Sabbath from 'sunset to sunset' during that considerable portion of the year wherein no such vicissitude exists? What part of the many weeks about the season of the winter solstice, when the sun rises not at all, or of the equally long period at the summer solstice, when he sets not at all, would your correspondent denominate *evening*? Should a Moravian missionary direct his Greenland converts to observe the Sabbath "from sunset to sunset," would he be understood, much less obeyed? and even the Christian inhabitants of Iceland, or of the Russian province of Archangel, would they not also feel confounded by a similar injunction? and yet they experience no difficulty in appropriating one diurnal revolution of the earth in seven, to Holy rest. In short, the Jewish regulation of beginning the Sabbath at sunset, indefinite as it apparently was, might be observed without inconvenience within the limited territory of Palestine; but surely for the world at large it would become a most irregular standard, varying with the climates of the globe, and its observance, as we have seen, in many cases absolutely impracticable; and hence I conclude, in the absence of all positive evidence to the contrary, that the Son of Man who is Lord of the Sabbath has made it no part of that sacred institution. By beginning the day at a fixed hour, as at twelve o'clock at night, we have a custom, a determinate rule, easy to be observed in all places and at all seasons, plainly within the spirit, and sufficiently within the letter, of the fourth commandment. C.

REMARKS ON MATT. XI. 11: REPLY TO PHILODEMUS.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

I TAKE the liberty of making some remarks on an exposition of Matt. xi. 11. which appeared in your August number of 1827, with the signature of Philodemus. The confused impression which I received on the first hasty perusal of that article did not produce in my mind a single objection. The want of perspicuity in the exposition was counterbalanced by the apparent plausibility with which it was supported and the brilliancy of the writer's language. But having lately turned to it, and having

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

New Series.

VOL. II.] SEPTEMBER, 1828. [No. IX.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF MISS JANE GRAY JENNINGS.

AMONG the most mysterious, and at the same time, the most instructive dealings of the Most High with his creatures, is the early removal from the world of individuals distinguished for their interesting and useful qualities. Seldom can this remark be made with greater propriety than with respect to her who is the subject of this article. A gentleman who had been her instructor, and in whose family he had spent several months, uses the following language to the writer respecting her death. "This event is surely among the mysteries of Providence. That a person so amiable, of such acquirements, of such piety, and of so much promise, should be taken away just as she was stepping forth to begin to act her part on the stage of life, is a problem not easily solved." Though the incidents of her life were neither numerous nor striking; though she did not live long enough to perform any uncommon service to the church or the world, and to lay her cotemporaries under any very special obligation, still by those who knew her best it is thought that a slight memorial is due to her intellectual and her moral worth.

JANE GRAY JENNINGS was born of respectable parents at Windham, Conn., April 13, 1804. She was the seventh in a family of eight children, and was early noticed as an uncommonly interesting and promising child. As her mind expanded in early youth, its capacity for application, its readiness of perception, and its power of retention, were found to be above the ordinary stamp. Soon after entering on her sixteenth year, having been deprived of her father by death, she removed to Tolland, a short distance from her native place, and took up her residence at the house of a friend, which through the remainder of life she regarded as her home. Under the guidance of this friend she soon commenced a course of classical and scientific studies, which she pursued with perseverance and success.

The change in public sentiment within the last few years on the subject of female education must by every intelligent individual be regarded as auspicious. While more importance is attached to the subject itself, of female education, a juster estimate is entertained in respect to the plan on which it should be conducted. Merely fashionable and external accomplishments, which were too often regarded as all in all in the education of young ladies, is giving place to the solid cultivation of the mind. The

Digitized by Google

Were similar methods pursued more in our day, instead of the abundant use of logic and metaphysics, which few who hear a popular discourse can fully comprehend—were the preacher to deal less in generals and more in particulars,—instead of talking about sin in the abstract, to specify individual sins and trace them in strong colours through all their odious consequences—were he to argue less from *principles* and more from *facts*,—to seek his proofs not in the schools, but in the study of human nature—to find his weapons not so much in his own head, as in the hearts of his hearers, we should hear less said about sleeping congregations.

Massillon's congregations did not sleep. He believed that if all men have not cultivated understandings all have affections. To these he directed his efforts. His hearers felt the hand of the preacher probing their hearts. They felt—and sometimes a whole audience were raised involuntarily from their seats.

Whitefield's hearers did not sleep. By his power of painting, in which consisted the chief magic of his eloquence, he carried men where he chose, with a touch more powerful than magic. He annihilated every thing but the scene he would present, and drawing aside the veil of eternity, now led his hearers to the opening gate of Heaven and now to the yawning pit of Hell.

Witness its effects on Chesterfield. The skeptic was present when Whitefield presented the votary of sin under the figure of a blind beggar, led by a little dog. The dog had broken his string. The blind cripple, with his staff between both hands, groped his way unconscious, to the side of a precipice. As he felt along with his staff, it dropped down the descent too deep to send back an echo. He thought it on the ground and bending forward took one careful step to recover it. But he trod on vacancy, poised for a moment, and as he fell headlong, Chesterfield sprung from his seat exclaming, By heavens he is gone!

Let me not be understood to recommend *tinsel—ornament*, or *gaudy coloring*. It is a most wretched substitute for *thought*. Nor yet, any painting addressed *merely* to the imagination. This may do for the poet. But the orator, especially the Christian orator, has a higher aim. He must paint to the *heart*. His images must speak to the soul. If they do this, his style will be different from the rainbow coloring of a vaporing fancy, as the steady sun, which enlightens, and guides, and warms, is different from the meteor, which leads only to bewilder, and dazzles only to blind.

MINIMUS' REPLY ON HOLY TIME.

When the Sabbath begnis is a practical question of no small importance. An agreement in opinion and practice would undoubtedly have no little influence in promoting the due sanctification of the Sabbath. And can it not be decided by the word of God? Doubtless every opinion and practice, founded on the word of God, can be proved by divine testimony, and does not need the *opinions* of erring man to establish it.

Much dependence is placed upon the present practice of the Jews. It is said that "they unite in beginning the Sabbath at sunset, or as some of the rabbies say, sun half an hour high," which I would ask, "and that their practice has never been changed." With them according to Hannah Adams's history of the Jews, "the Sabbath begins on Friday an hour before sunset both summer and winter." Now if their practice has never been changed, and is authority for us, then we ought to begin the Sabbath an hour before sunset. And those who adduce their practice as authority, to be consistent, ought to begin the Sabbath, not

Digitized by Google

at sunset, but an hour before sunset. But if their practice has been changed, it is no authority. For it might have been changed seven hours as well as one.

The simple fact to be established is, which did God reckon as belonging to the day, and what was the practice of the Jews while they were God's people, and what was the practice of the apostles, and the churches in their day. And this can be established only by divine testimony, by inspired writers. For they only were witnesses of the fact. Roman historians were eye-witnesses of "the shows of the gladiators" and could testify to the fact. But had they derived their knowledge of the fact from books which we possess, we should be as competent witnesses as they are. Why then is so much time spent in collecting the opinions of uninspired and fallible men, when we have the same means of judging which they possessed?

Many witnesses are brought forward. But not one of them can testify to the fact. For none of them were present. And they can only give their opinions. The inspired writers alone are competent witnesses. For they only were present. And is not their testimony sufficiently clear and explicit to decide the question? Moses testifies that God commanded the Israelites to keep the passover on the fourteenth day of the month, Lev. xxiii. 5, Ex. xii. 6, to kill it at the going down of the sun, Deut. xvi. 6, which if between the evenings, must mean near the going down of the sun, to eat it roasted and in the night. Ex. xii. 8. Now if they were commanded to eat it on the fourteenth day, and yet on the night following the fourteenth day, then the evening following the day certainly belonged to the day. And this reasoning is "neither set aside," nor in the least affected "by the consideration of two evenings," but it is absolutely conclusive, unless it can be shown that *night* here means *day*, and that the Israelites could kill the paschal lamb at the going down of the sun, and then roast it, and after that, eat it before the going down of the sun. It is in vain to bring forward the opinions of fabulous Jewish writers, or of commentators, in opposition to these plain commands of God, and declarations of Moses. Could it be shown from these writers that the Jews, in after ages kept the passover in the afternoon, it would prove nothing, except that they disregarded the divine command, which expressly required them to keep it in the night. John testifies, xiii. 30, that Jesus kept the passover in the night, and Mark in the evening, xiv. 17. Now if Christ kept the passover according to the commandment, and thus "fulfilled all righteousness," then he kept it in the evening or night following the fourteenth day, and yet kept it on the fourteenth day. Consequently the evening following the fourteenth must belong to the day, and so of Sabbath evening. For the passover sometimes fell on the Sabbath. And here are two inspired witnesses, whose testimony is most explicit, and postive, and cannot be set aside. And as in the mouth of two witnesses every word shall be established, I might here rest the cause. But it may be proper briefly to examine some counter testimony which it is thought by some "shows satisfactorily that the Jewish Sabbath begun at sunset."

It is said that Lev. xxiii. 32, "furnishes direct and positive proof." But this passage has no reference to the weekly Sabbath, but to the day of atonement, called here a Sabbath, and which was to be observed in a peculiar manner, as is evident from the expression, which is very peculiar, "It shall be unto you a sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls: in the ninth day of the month at even, from even to even shall ye celebrate your sabbath." It is not said at the close of the ninth day, or in the evening after the ninth day, but

Digitized by Google

in the ninth day at even. What language could show plainer that they were to *begin* the solemn service on the evening of the ninth day? And it is admitted that "the ninth day at even, was the ninth day before sunset." It is no where said that they must keeponly the tenth day. But they were commanded to keep the tenth day and also to begin on the evening of the ninth. And I showed that the expression, from one time *to* another included both, consequently from even to even included both evenings. See verses 15. 16, of this chapter. Ex. xii. 15. See also 17 and 18. Hence this passage affords no evidence that "the Jews begun their Sabbath at sunset."

It is thought that Nehemiah's commanding the gates of Jerusalem to be shut when it began to be dark before the Sabbath, proves that the Sabbath begun at sunset. But I should think it proved directly the reverse. For how could the gates begin to be dark *before* the Sabbath, if the Sabbath began at sunset? And would Nehemiah have left them open till it began to be dark? It is said they were shaded by mountains. But it is not said they were *shaded*, but *dark*. And how could they be dark before sunset, especially as Jerusalem was built on mountains? I ascribed a reason why Nehemiah commanded the gates to be shut at dark, though the evening did not belong to the Sabbath, which no one has attempted to prove not to be valid.

Ezekiel, xlvi. 1, 2, is thought to afford proof that the Sabbath begun at sunset, because the gate of the inner court was to be open on the Sabbath, and not to be shut until evening. But if the Sabbath did not end until midnight can any suppose the gate would have been ordered to be shut at midnight, instead of not until evening, and consequently required the gate to be kept open till the *close* of the evening?

The mere circumstance that the Jews brought their sick to Christ to be healed when the sun was set on the Sabbath is urged as affording strong proof that the Sabbath was then ended, and that they considered it unlawful to heal in the day time, though there is not the least intimation that this was the reason that they brought them then. Christ had healed three on the same Sabbath without any complaint, and one by the request of the rulers of the Jews. It is supposed that the centurion's servant mentioned in Matt. viii. and Luke vii. might not be healed on the Sabbath. If this were admitted, how much is gained? Still Christ healed two others on the Sabbath, without any objection from any one, but on the contrary they spread abroad his fame in consequence. It is said, that the centurion's servant, mentioned by Matthew and Luke, might not be the same. But this is contrary to plain evidence, and to the opinion of Pool, Whitby, Gill, Burkitt, Campbell, Scott, and Clark. It is said that "the mere fact, that it is named in connexion with the healing of Peter's wife's mother," (which was on the Sabbath,) "proves nothing." So I might say, and perhaps with as much reason, that the mere fact, that their bringing their sick to be healed in the evening is narrated in connexion with events done on the Sabbath, proves nothing, or does not prove that it was the evening after the Sabbath. It was at Capernaum that the centurion came to Christ in behalf of his servant. And when Christ came to Capernaum, he straightway on the Sabbath day, entered into the synagogues, and therefore undoubtedly healed the servant on the Sabbath. See Mark i. 21, and Matt. viii. 5.

It is true the scribes and pharisees charged Christ with breaking the Sabbath by healing on the Sabbath. But if they had believed the charge, as the breach of the Sabbath was death, why did they seek for false witnesses to put him to death? And if they believd that he had broken

Digitized by Google

the Sabbath, why were all his adversaries ashamed, after they had brought the charge? They charged him with having a devil, and casting out devils by the prince of the devils. But did they believe it? It is alleged that the people were afraid the rulers would oppose their bringing their sick to Christ on the Sabbath. We repeatedly read that the rulers were afraid of the people, but never that the people were afraid of the rulers. I showed by quotations from our Missionaries in Palestine, that for their comfort and health, they sometimes kept themselves within doors till sunset and set out to travel after sunset, and travelled all night. And as the heat is often very oppressive till after sunset, it is much more rational to suppose they brought the sick after sunset, to avoid the heat, than that they thought it unlawful to heal on the Sabbath after Christ had healed several with their high approbation, or that they were afraid of their rulers.

It is thought that the following passage, Luke xxiii. 54, "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on," "proves conclusively, that the evening before and not after belonged to the day." It is said that *drew on* means that the Sabbath had just begun. But how could that day be the preparation which was the day *before* the Sabbath, and yet the Sabbath had begun? Besides, the women after that, see ver. 55, 56, went to work and prepared spices and ointments, and then "rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandment." But if the Sabbath had already begun, how could they do this work, and yet rest according to the commandment, which required that they should do no work? According to this opinion, it was after sunset, when these women went to work, because it is said the Sabbath had begun. I think it evident that it was after sunset. And as they afterwards rested according to the commandment, it is "a conclusive" evidence that the Sabbath had not begun, and "that the evening after, not before, belonged to the day.

Because the Jews did not wait till midnight before they took the bodies from the cross previous to the Sabbath, it is inferred that the Sabbath must have begun before that hour, though the law expressly required that they should be taken down and buried the same day, whether the following were the Sabbath or not. Deut. xxi. 22, 23.

It is said that Joseph put the body of Jesus into a new and unfinished sepulchre, because it was night, and he had not time to carry it elsewhere before the Sabbath. But there is no evidence that it was unfinished. It was his own tomb, Matt. xxvii. 60, and probably costly. And where else would he have wished to have laid it? Isa. liii. 9. If it is supposed any haste is expressed, John xix. 41, 42, it was not on account of the approach of the Sabbath, but "because of the Jews' preparation."

Another argument about of equal weight with the foregoing is adduced from Matt. xxvii. 62—64. The substance of it is, that the next day after the preparation, that is on the Sabbath, the chief priests and pharisees came to Pilate, and requested that the sepulchre might be made sure, lest the disciples should come and steal the body away, and that they would not have left it a night unguarded; consequently it was the same evening that the body was put into the tomb. And as it was the next day, the Sabbath must have begun. But they said to Pilate, "That deceiver said, while he was yet alive, 'After three days I will rise again.'" And were they afraid his disciples would come that night, and steal him away, and thus prove him to be a deceiver, and a false prophet? Beside the impression *next day* never means the *same night*, or the evening following. See Num. xi. 32; 1 Sam. xxx. 17; Jonah. iv. 7; John i. 29; Acts iv. 3, and vii. 26. It is

Digitized by Google

here worthy of remark, that those who accused Christ of breaking the Sabbath by healing the sick, went on the Sabbath to Pilate, and procured a band of soldiers, and made the sepulchre sure, and set a watch. And this shows how much regard they had for the Sabbath, and how much sincerity there was in their accusation, and that it was only "through envy," that they accused him of breaking the Sabbath.

I have now examined all the passages adduced to prove that the evening preceding the Sabbath belongs to the Sabbath. And if I am not greatly deceived, a cause which rests on such a support must fall.

I have stated that the body of Jesus was put into the tomb after sunset, and that if the Sabbath begun at sunset, he could not have been "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," according to his prediction. And this argument cannot be set aside by the supposition of two evenings, and that it was the first evening, when Joseph came and begged the body of Jesus. For it is admitted that the word *evening* more generally is used to denote the commencement of darkness or sunset. Propriety would therefore require that it should be so understood here, unless something forbids it. And does any thing forbid such an explanation, except a preconceived opinion and a practice which are inconsistent with it? "When the evening was come Joseph came to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus." But this could not be the first evening. For Christ did not expire till after the first evening had come. And he had been dead παλαι a *long time*, when Joseph came. Pilate's surprise that "he was already dead," is not strange, when it is considered that some lived on the cross "three days, and some starved to death."* It does not appear, that the expression, "when the even was come," is ever used in reference to the first evening. But it can be shown conclusively that it denotes the second evening or sunset. See Matt. xiv. 15, 23, and viii. 16, compared with Mark i. 32, Matt. xx. 8, Matt. xxvi. 20, compared with John xiii. 30, and Deut. xiv. 6, Micah vi. 35, 47, John vi. 16, 17. After the body was taken down from the cross, it was embalmed before it was put in the tomb, John xix. 39, 40. Can any person consider these things impartially, and yet believe that the body of Christ was put in the tomb before sunset? It is *admitted* that it was sunset. For it is contended that "the Sabbath was begun," which it is said begun at sunset.

In John xx. 19, the evening following the first day of the week, is expressly called the evening of the first day of the week. And if there were no circumstances to determine which evening is meant, as it is admitted that "the word generally denotes the second," it ought to be so understood. But when it is considered, that the two disciples going to Emaus, constrained Christ, who appeared to be a stranger on a journey, to abide with them, "because it was toward evening, and the day was far spent;" and they went in and took supper, and then returned to Jerusalem, seven miles on foot, and related what was done in the way and at supper, before Christ appeared to them "at evening being the first day of the week," I cannot think that any one will really believe it was still before sunset. Luke xxiv. 13—36.

But it is urged that, if John meant the second evening, he might follow the Roman manner of reckoning. And the Romans, it is said, began the day at midnight. The Encyclopedia says they began the day at sunset. But admitting they began their day at midnight, was not John writing for the instruction of Christians? And if that evening did not belong to the first day of the week, or the Sabbath, was not his statement

* Buck's Theological Dictionary, Article, Cross.

Digitized by Google

calculated to mislead?' And was it true? This would be very different from the unphilosophical, but common mode of speaking of the sun's rising and setting, and would teach an important practical error. John's calling the evening after the first day of the week the evening of the first day of the week, therefore proves that it belonged to the day.

The Sabbath was appointed by God for his worship and to attend upon his ordinances. And the Lord's day was the proper season for celebrating the Lord's Supper. Accordingly we find, Acts xx. 7, that the disciples at Troas came together to break bread on the first day of the week. Though Paul was so much engaged that he preached till midnight, still they came together to break bread on the Christian Sabbath. But at what time did they meet? If they viewed the Sabbath as ending at sunset, they would have *designed* to meet early enough for Paul to preach at least a sermon of usual length, and then administer the Lord's Supper before sunset. And did Paul preach from an early hour in the afternoon till midnight? And if they met in the afternoon, why did they provide "lights?" ver. 8. These things show that they met on the evening of the first day of the week, and kept that as holy time.

When people meet for divine worship on the Sabbath, the holiness and sacredness of the day adds solemnity and interest to the services. The practice of those therefore, who *habitually* neglect to meet for the worship of God Saturday evening, when they consider it holy time, and belonging to the day which God has set apart for his worship, and meet on Sabbath evening, which they do not consider as holy time, proves their inconsistency, but not that the apostles and primitive Christians were thus inconsistent. And if their meeting on the evening of the first day of the week for divine worship does not prove that it belongs to the Sabbath, how does their meeting on the first day of the week prove that that is the Christian Sabbath, or that the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week?

MINIMUS.

EXPOSITION OF MATTHEW XXII. 31, 32.

But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God saying,

I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

This is our Saviour's argument with the Sadducees. *For the Sadducees say, there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit.* Acts xxiii. 8. The foundation of their doctrine was the tenet that there is nothing out of God, excepting material objects. They were engaged in a continual controversy with the Pharisees, and as is often the case in controversy, both parties receded from truth. The Pharisees, blind to the spiritual nature of the expected kingdom of heaven, imagined that when Christ should begin to reign, there would be a resurrection of the bodies of the people of God, such as they were in this life, with the same qualities and the same relations. As they were very strenuous advocates for the doctrine of the resurrection, the Sadducees very naturally concluded, or at least assumed, that this was the true doctrine of the resurrection. Of course, if they could reduce this pharisaical notion of the resurrection to an absurdity, they considered themselves as triumphant in the argument.

Christ tells them, *Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, neither the power of God.* v. 29. He then goes on to state that his doctrine of the resurrection was different from that of the Pharisees. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor

Digitized by Google